DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 044 825 EA 003 179

AUTHOR Ellena, William J.; Redfern, George B.
TITLE Illinois Resident Program for Educational Leadership.
PUB DATE Aug 70
NOTE 90p.; Program evaluation

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$4.60
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Responsibility, *Administrator Role, *Inservice Programs, *Leadership, *Leadership Training

ABSTRACT

An inservice program for 20 practicing administrators holding degrees in school administration was conducted at the University of Illinois during the 1969-1970 academic year. Program objectives were (1) to provide administrators with an opportunity under guidance to strengthen and develop conceptual bases and to improve their administrative performance, (2) to develop and utilize programs and resources within the university as they apply to problems administrators bring to the campus, (3) to provide an opportunity for the university community to interact with practicing administrators, and (4) to systematically apply the concepts and theories of educational administration to real problems. Results of a questionnaire showed that participants considered the program highly successful in fulfilling their expectations and enabling them to function more effectively. Copies of evaluation questionnaires are appended. A related document is EA 003 180. (Portions of Appendix B in handwriting may reproduce poorly because of marginal legibility.) (LLR)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED044825

ILLINOIS RESIDENT PROGRAM FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

An Evaluation

by

William J. Ellena
George B. Redfern

EA 003 179

ED044825

William J. Ellena, Deputy Executive Secretary, American Association of School Administrators, 1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C.

George B. Redfern, Associate Secretary, American Association of School Administrators, 1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
Part I	Some Thoughts on the Education of the School Administrator	1
Part II	The Illinois Resident Program for Educational Leadership	14
Part III	What the Participants Said	17
Part IV	Conclusions and Recommendations.	28

PART I

SOME THOUGHTS ON THE EDUCATION OF THE SCHOOL ADMINISTRATOR

Ezra Cornell commented at the opening of Cornell University, "There is not a single thing finished." This ringing challenge to a great university in its infancy so aptly expressed in this terse and simple phrase is echoed in school systems throughout the length and breadth of the land. The final answer to most school problems--whether they be in the field of curriculum content, instructional methods, personnel policy, business practices, pupil guidance, school plant construction, internal organization, or school community relationships--is never acquired. The professional growth of the superintendent and members of his staff is never completed. The responsibility of the school district for increasing the understanding, broadening the vision, stimulating the growth, and developing and perfecting new skills and new techniques on the part of all people--administrators and teachers, custodians and maintenance employees, bus drivers and cafeteria workers--is never entirely met. In every school district there is always room for improvement. There are always items of unfinished business.

The idea of sending a man to the moon and bringing him back safe and sound is a puny concept and a simple undertaking compared to the belief that every man is unique and important and that an education can be designed and executed so that every man can achieve his full

potentials. No nobler idea was ever conceived by any nation, no greater responsibility was ever placed on a man-made institution, no greater complex of vision, courage and competence was ever demanded of one who assumes the public leadership for a public service than now rests upon the school administrator.

Since there are many school districts there must be many superintendents--all with much the same responsibilities and duties. There can be no farm clubs, no minor leagues in public education. Since the 100 pupils in the small district are individuals, each with his own unique importance, they deserve and must have the same opportunities, the same quality of education as do the individuals in the district with 10,000 pupils enrolled. As in the United States of America, the pupils in the poorest and most culturally disadvantaged communities have the same right to human dignity and opportunity as do the individuals in the richest and most culturally privileged communities. Their education should be designed to serve them fully and equally.

The superintendent in every school district today must be an educational statesman, alert, courageous, and driven by a compelling desire to keep abreast of the times and to be increasingly successful in improving the schools. Knowing and desiring all this, his strongest fear is that of personal obsolescence.

The good superintendent knows that in the age of wonder drugs, in the age of fision and fusion of the atom, in the age of space travel, in an age when all men of all races and of all places in the world have visions of a better life, there can be no standing still. If the schools are to fulfill their avowed mission, the superintendent must not only hold fast to the basic values of the past, but he must also run forward with the school program faster than the world itself.

To do this he knows that his own vision, his own insights, his own values, his own knowledge must be constantly refined and improved. Systematically and enthusiastically he must plan for and seek out resources that may give him the new competence he needs. Some of his growth may come by reading, some by conferring and inquiring with indivduals and with groups, some of it will come by travel, some by research, some by other means of communication, but most will come through the thoughtful contemplation of the new and old and of the ends for which man lives. The superintendent must agree that there is no place in school administration for the weary, the complacent, the dejected, the self-satisfied, the timid, or the uninformed.

The superintendent, as an individual, must keep abreast of the march of cultural change, with its implications on every hand for educational planning and the operation of the schools; he must keep informed of current research findings in education and in related fields; he must keep in step with advances in school administration; in short he must keep professionally alert and up-to-date. To move along the road that leads to these ends requires personal concerns, personal initiative, and personal effort. Worthwhile and substantial professional growth does not happen incidentally or take place automatically with the passing years. It is accomplished through a carefully planned professional improvement program that is followed assiduously.

Quality education moves forward on a broad front. As the educational leader, the superintendent must become ever more competent, ever more alert to the forces and pressures that play on education, ever more sensitive to the elements of excellence in education. So, too, must his staff. The superintendent has an obligation, a responsibility,

and a challenge constantly to encourage, stimulate, and make provisions for continual inservice growth by his staff. Ever higher must each climb.

No firmer concept should any board of education have than that the school system can seldom be better than its superintendent. No wiser course can it take than to help make him so. With firm belief that the search for school improvement and educational excellence is a continuous and evolving enterprise, wise boards of education will leave no stone unturned to help the superintendent to be adequate for its task. The wise school board like most progressive industrial corporations will recognize the profit that comes with giving its chief executive extended experiences that bring new concepts, new knowledge, and added powers of professional leadership. The board's stated policy and their budget should assist their superintendent to participate in seminars, conferences, and high level study groups; their assistance should stimulate him to participate actively in professional and scholarly associations, and to engage in research at times; their spirit should stimulate his reading, writing, and his participation in cultural pursuits, such as concerts, plays and visits to art galleries; their policies and budgetary aids should give him reasonable assistance so that he can be free to visit and study new developments and new practices in other communities and in other states.

Because of the very nature of his position as chief administrator, as chief leader in the school system he is a lonely man. There is no other position in the school system fully comparable to his own.

He stands alone. Conciously or subconciously, he feels a need for the stimulation that comes from the exchange of ideas, sharing of experiences, and union with other men and women holding positions comparable to his own in attacking regional, state, and national problems of an educational nature. Such team effort and mutual helpfulness in the professional growth of school superintendents are nurtured and sustained by regional study groups, institutes and workshops, conferences and committees, and through active participation in university sponsored seminars.

Preservice education programs at best provide only a minimum. Universities do not meet their responsibilities to school administration through a preservice preparation program that merely meets certification standards--graduating students, helping them secure positions, and sending them on their way with a professional blessing.

As a concomitant of rapid cultural change, new educational issues emerge and unpredicted administrative problems arise with recurring frequency. Even the best prepared superintendents are not fully prepared to meet these problems without highly competent advisory and technical assistance. Universities that operate preservice preparation programs have a great opportunity to improve school administration and to add substantially to the quality of public education by providing follow-up services not only to their graduates who hold positions as school superintendents, but also to all school systems. The best conceived and the best executed preservice preparation program for school administrators is only a beginning.

Experience, research, and common sense indicate the school superintendent's program of continuous learning should be based on the assumption that in his capacity as educational leader and as executive

officer of the school board he together with his staff must:

(1) Have a deep devotion to the human values which are at the heart of America's purpose and upon which her destiny rests, and an understanding of the galaxy of relationships and ethical beliefs upon which those values and ethical principles are based.

(2) Be able to make wise and sound decisions toward the improvement of teaching and toward more efficient learning.

(3) Know laboratory and classroom environments, tools for teaching, and the structural organization for deployment of staff and pupils.

(4) Be well schooled in what science and research show about the expectations, drives, fears, interests, and personal diversities that exist in groups of teachers, children, and youths.

(5) Understand the American public--what it is, what it wants, how it is organized, how it can make itself felt, and who leads it.

(6) Be efficient in using public funds.

(7) Have a combination of personal power, insight, and skill which enables him to get a team of associates to work closely and effectively with him. Some of the most energetic and intellectually astute superintendents find themselves carrying more and more burdens because they unknowingly tie in knots the energies and abilities of the men and women who are closest to them.

(8) Have wisdom and good judgment as well as skill in oral and written communication.

(9) Possess creative, imaginative, and realistic competence in sensing societies evolutionary and emerging aspirations and needs.

(10) Have the vision, courage, and patience needed to plan wisely for the future.

(11) Be professionally competent in many areas of evaluation.

(12) Comprehend the educational needs of adults, as well as the educational needs of children and youths.

(13) Have an education which feeds upon education, which generates an unappeasable thirst for more understanding, and which keeps him far out in front of the doggedly persuing menace of obsolescence.

Nearly everyone wants to make the schools better. Many approaches are made and many others proposed, but common sense strongly suggests that an efficient and economical way of improving the schools is through strengthening the school superintendent, for everything he does affects a great many other people.

The quality of the educational program is improved through the superintendent's leadership in

- Mobilizing a high-quality staff.
- Maintaining circumstances in which its full potential is used.
- Moving people in the community to provide adequate financial support.
- Casting problems into opportunities for improvement.
- Meeting successive challenges.

Any improvements made in education in this country during the next 15 or 20 years will be made largely through the leadership of people now employed in administrative positions. They are the most capable administrators the country has ever had. They have

- Fully met professional standards for certification.
- Completed preservice preparation programs.
- Had many years experience as teachers, principals, and administrators.

They know more about school administration than any other group of people in the nation. But with all their experience and all their understanding, school administrators will fall behind the times unless

- They remain keenly sensitive to the educational implications of cultural change.
- They see with clarity the relationship of the schools to all society.
- They keep abreast of research findings, technological developments, and innovations taking place in every facet of the culture.

They will fall behind unless they continue to grow professionally on the job. School administrators who provide the leadership essential for keeping the school program alive and vigorous

- Keep pace with developments.
- Respond to challenges.
- Keep long range perspective.
- Provide incentives and nurture inventiveness.
- Make necessary adaptations in the program.
- Maintain effective relationships between staff members.

- Hold the power of initiative and delegate responsibility for handling details.
- Prevent administration from splintering through specialization and the development of hierarchies.
- Minimize reliance on written communications and directives and on rules, routines, and formulas.
- Discard outmoded procedures.
- Are not afraid of innovations even when they disturb the status quo.

An effective inservice program will assist superintendents now employed and on the job in meeting challenges and problems which confront the schools, problems emerging from

- Forces affecting economic enterprise.
- Population growth and mobility.
- Struggles for civil rights.
- Social tensions.
- Urbanization and all that goes with it.
- Changes in customs, mores, and value patterns.
- Shifts in the power structure of community life.
- The impact of mass media of communication.
- New developments and emphases in science and mathematics.
- New instructional methods.
- New approaches to school organization.

An effective inservice program will assist in meeting problems of immediate and vital concern, but it will fall short of its mark and if it did not go beyond dealing with immediate problems and help the

administrator rise above his daily task to see the public schools and the total educational enterprise with a fresh eye and in broad perspective. An effective inservice program will provide the energy, drive, sensitivity to relationships among people, among programs, and among institutions that will keep the schools vitally alive. It will help create and sustain circumstances in which everyone in the school system is enthusiastic about what he is doing and gets satisfaction from his efforts.

An effective inservice program should

- Be directed especially to school superintendents, but help everyone with vital concern and important responsibility in administration.
- Deal directly with problems confronting school systems and school superintendents.
- Be planned cooperatively by the people receiving the services and those providing them.
- Have sufficient depth and breadth to be of real educational value for all involved.
- Deal with causes rather than symptoms of problems.
- Have continuity essential for professional growth.
- Be so financed that no school district or particular individual is deprived of its benefits.
- Be clearly recognized and supported by school board policy.
- Make use of a wide variety of resources.
- Be research oriented.

No school superintendent will serve his district well who does not allocate a minimum number of hours every week to his own professional improvement. Professional growth is a part of his regular job. Time allocated for this purpose should be rigorously protected and used to the best possible advantage. This time may be devoted to

- Reading--to broaden perspectives and keep abreast of persistent and emerging issues.
- Conferring with well-informed people.
- Serving on professional commissions or committees.
- Attending professional meetings.
- Attending workshops or institutes.
- Taking formal course work in a university program.
- Participating in a research project.
- Contributing to professional literature.
- Working with staff in experimental projects and long-range planning.

The institution of higher education that assumes responsibility for an inservice program for school administration should have a definite commitment to this purpose--a commitment as firmly established as its commitment to a preservice program. This commitment should be given tangible form through

- Allocating funds to support an inservice program.
- Establishing a planning committee to develop the broad outlines of an inservice program.
- Making a staff member individually responsible for an inservice program.

- Employing personnel to work with administrators and other employees in local school systems.
- Planning and sustaining research projects to provide information needed to deal with important educational problems.
- Establishing and implementing policies to make resources of all departments in the university available for use in inservice programs.
- Developing a plan of financial support for an inservice program without relying primarily on charges for credit hours.

A basic purpose of the inservice program for school administrators is to bring about professional growth in individuals. Every individual entering school administration should bring with him both the willingness and the ability to continue learning. In developing long-range plans for this continued professional growth he should

- Budget time for formal studies, for visitation of other school systems, for workshops and conferences, and for university work.
- Begin early in his career the development of a personal library of periodicals, books, reports, and other materials dealing with important problems in school administration.
- Plan to make some financial investment in his own personal development; professional growth will not just happen nor can it be had for the mere asking.
- Join with fellow administrators in analyzing forces that have a bearing on educational policy, administrative decisions, and the character of the instructional program.

- Assume a share of responsibility through his professional association for developing and sustaining an inservice program.
- Form a commitment to upgrading and strengthening school administration through professional growth.

As administrators evaluate inservice programs for school administrators, specific indexes that focus attention sharply on the organization and operation of the program must be applied in an objective manner. These indexes may be stated as a series of probing questions, such as, does the inservice program for school administration

- Fit the needs of the particular school district in which it operates?
- Deal with problems of real concern to administrators and other people in the school district?
- Help administrators help themselves?
- Bring essential information to bear on problems at the right time?
- Reach all administrators who need and want to participate in the program?
- Use available financial and human resources to best advantage?
- Stimulate continued professional growth?
- Support long-range planning?
- Create a climate that encourages staff members to innovate?

PART II

THE ILLINOIS RESIDENT PROGRAM FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

The Illinois Resident Program for Educational Leadership had its genesis in the minds of Professor Van Miller and Associate Professor Thomas Sergiovanni of the University of Illinoi. Professors Miller and Sergiovanni submitted a proposal for a pilot project to the U.S. Office of Education under Part D of the Education Professions Development Act to establish the Illinois Resident Program for Educational Leadership. The project was expected to run, in its pilot stage, from January, 1969 until July, 1970 with the total funds requested approximating $50,000.

The Illinois Resident Program for Educational Leadership was intended to provide an opportunity for approximately 20 administrators who are in leadership positions in the nation's schools to spend a minimum of three weeks on the campus of the University of Illinois in independent study, consultation with educators (those in the basic disciplines and also those in related applied sciences), and in interaction with advanced graduate students. Participants were chosen on the basis of the quality of their proposal for study, the extent to which they and the profession theoretically will benefit by their study, and the extent to which the university possesses the resources to assist the individual in grappling with their stated needs.

The resident program was not designed as an advanced degree program. Rather, it was directed at administrators who are presently in positions of leadership and influence throughout educational institutions in this country. The focus of the Illinois program was not on a given set of problems or series of problems per se, but rather on improving the capability of practicing administrators to deal more effectively with problems they perceive and that have relevance to them as well as to provide conceptional tools which would permit them to face problems in the future which are at the present time undefinable.

The stated objectives of the program, as conceived by Professors Miller and Sergiovanni, are

(1) To provide administrators in positions of leadership in educational institutions with an opportunity under guidance to strengthen and develop conceptual bases which will more effectively improve their administrative performance;

(2) To develop and utilize programs and resources within the university as they apply to problems administrators bring to the campus;

(3) To provide those in the university community with an opportunity to interract on a collegial basis with educational leaders in practicing positions; and

(4) To more systematically apply the concepts and theories relating to educational administration to problems the participants bring to the campus.

Each applicant for the program was required to submit a planned study or other suitable proposal which outlined the problems or study focus or his theory at a residency. On the basis of his proposal appropriate university resources including educational administration department faculty and graduate assistants were placed at his disposal during his period of residency. The culminating activity was a four day conference in June, 1970. The Illinois Resident Program for Educational Leadership has very high qualitative, if only limited direct quantitative potential. It focuses on upgrading the professional competancy and sensitivities of 20 practicing administrators who hold degrees in school administration. Yet, 20 administrators who are incumbents of leadership positions in education will presumably immeasurably influence other professionals, programs, and institutions. Also the program is believed to have a substantial impact on professor/administrator relationships and on improved preparation programs.

PART III

WHAT THE PARTICIPANTS SAID

Evaluation is an intricate and difficult, albeit, essential process if progress is to be achieved. In pursuing their investigation the project evaluators also were mindful of the concerns expressed recently by the National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development.

The Council was established to advise the President of the United States and the Congress on federal programs dealing with the training of educational personnel. In a recent report, it warned that "Meaningless evaluation is ruining the cutting edge of educational innovation." Singled out for special criticism were "premature evaluation" and "almost total preoccupation with so-called hard data developed by the mass use of standardized tests."

With regard to its charge of overdependence on test data, the Council said, "Such test results provide a very useful type of evidence. However, to capture the full sense of what is being accomplished in a project, a variety of evaluation techniques should be employed."

Other practices found by the Council to have adverse effects on educational innovation were "concern for only final results, with little effort to determine why the objectives of a project were or were not achieved . . . a tendency to construe tentative findings as proof and a compulsion to label an educational endeavor as either a 'dramatic success' or a 'dismal failure'."

As independent educational auditors for the Illinois Resident Program for Educational Leadership, independent in the sense that the evaluators have no direct connection with the Project, we have been cautioned by the Council's observations. In our opinion the codirectors of the Illinois Resident Program are to be commended for building into the Program the opportunity for a third party evaluation. As Leon Lessinger, former associate commissioner in the U.S. Office of Education, stated, "The independent auditor is a third party whose outside objectivity nutures respect for the project report as an honest accounting of what has happened . . . in relation to locally established objectives."

The authors of this report sought answers to numerous questions. What full-time positions did the participants hold? What was the age distribution? Did they receive full cooperation from college faculty members? In their opinion were the library resources adequate? Were there university personnel that possessed the special competence needed to assist participants in their problem area? Was an adequate opportunity provided for the participants to interact with other participants? Was the three-week period too long, about right, or too short? What in the opinion of the participants constituted the single greatest strength in the program and the single greatest weakness?

To secure answers to these and other questions, the evaluators prepared a questionnaire (See Appendix A) and circulated the questionnaire to every participant, urging them to respond. The cooperation received was heartening. Seventeen participants in the Illinois Resident Program for Educational Leadership responded providing answers to each of the

questions directed to them. On the basis of the data received it is possible to make several observations.

The participants did indeed come from positions of educational influence and leadership (See Table I). The mean age of participants was 40-44 with the range being 30-34 to 55-59. All but one of the participants were married.

Respondents were asked to report their perceptions of the adequacy of resources, human and otherwise, that were made available to program participants. Generally speaking, the University of Illinois is to be commended. With rare exception, respondents stated that the cooperation, resources, and experiences that they had tended to be either "good" or "excellent." However, it should be noted that more than half of the participants felt that they did not have access to professorial staff possessing a high level of competence in the area of immediate concern to the participant. At the same time the vast bulk (14 out of 17 participants) stated that the cooperation that they received from the faculty in the College of Education was excellent (See Table IV).

The length of the program apparently met with the approval of the participants. Only four of the seventeen respondents stated that it was either too long, too short, or "too long to be away, too short to be comprehensive" (See Table V).

Without exception, the participants felt that the Program fully met their expectations and that the experience will enable them to function more effectively when they return to their full-time professional positions (See Tables VI and VII).

One of the questions on the questionnaire asked the respondents to identify the single greatest strength of the Program as they perceived it.

The overwhelming majority of the responses (12 out of a possible 19) stated that the opportunity to pursue unstructured study of a problem of major concern to them was the single greatest strength of the Program. Other responses included reference to the strength of the University staff, the excellence of library resources, the opportunity to pool and share with other participants, the opportunity to interact with professorial staff, and the stimulation provided by individual staff members (See Table VIII).

When asked to identify the single greatest weakness of the Program, it was difficult for the evaluators to detect any consensus. Only three participants out of seventeen could agree on any single item as a major weakness in the Program. The most frequently cited weakness was the excessive length of the Program, three participants citing this factor. No more than two participants out of the seventeen could agree on any other factor as being the single greatest weakness of the Program (See Table IX).

When asked to suggest ways in which the Illinois Resident Program could be improved for future participants, the suggestions received were extremely diverse. Seventeen specific suggestions were made. Although it should be pointed out that with the exception of three items, the frequency of mention was one.

In short, the authors of this report believe that, on the basis of responses provided to them by the participants, the Illinois Resident Program for Educational Leadership as perceived by the particpants was a near unqualified success. Although criticisms were leveled and suggestions for improvement were made, the participants were pleased with

their experience, felt it met their expectations, and enabled them to function more effectively. The Department of Educational Administration at the College of Education at the University of Illinois and Professors Van Miller and Thomas Sergiovanni are in our opinion to be commended for developing a truly meaningful and valued learning experience.

TABLE I

POSITIONS HELD BY PARTICIPANTS
IN ILLINOIS RESIDENT PROGRAM

Position	Number
Superintendent of schools	7
Personnel coordinator	3
Assistant superintendent	2
Instructional services director	2
Secondary education, director	1
Elementary school principal	1
Director of claims and accounting	1
TOTAL	17

TABLE II

PARTICIPANTS BY AGE AND SEX

Age	Sex	
	Male	Female
Under age 25	-	-
25-29	-	-
30-34	1	-
35-39	3	-
40-44	7	-
45-49	5	-
50-54	-	-
55-59	1	-
60 +	-	-
TOTAL	17	0

TABLE III

PARTICIPANTS BY MARITAL STATUS

Marital Status	Number
Married	16
Single	1
TOTAL	17

TABLE IV

ADEQUACY OF RESOURCES AS PERCEIVED BY PARTICIPANTS

FACTOR	Excellent	Good	Average	Unsatis-factory	Poor	No Opinion
The cooperation I received from the faculty in the college of education was	14	3	-	-	-	-
The cooperation I received from professors in other colleges and/or departments was	9	7	-	-	-	1
Library resources in the area of my interest were	9	5	3	-	-	-
Were there staff members with a high degree of competence in the area of your interest	7	7	2	1	-	-
Generally, I felt the experiences I had at the University of Illinois were	12	5	-	-	-	-
The opportunity to interact with other advanced graduate students was	8	7	2	-	-	-

TABLE V

'ADEQUACY OF LENGTH OF PROGRAM

AS PERCEIVED BY PARTICIPANTS

ADEQUACY	NUMBER
Too Long	1
About Right	13
Too Short	2
TOTAL	16*

*One respondent failed to select from among the three options. He stated the duration of the program was "too long to be away, too short to be comprehensive."

TABLE VI

EXTENT TO WHICH PROGRAM MEASURED

UP TO THE PARTICIPANTS' EXPECTATIONS

EXPECTATION	NUMBER
Fully met my expectations	17
Failed to meet my expectations	-
No opinion	-
TOTAL	17

TABLE VII

EFFECT OF PARTICIPATION ON JOB PERFORMANCE

AS PERCEIVED BY PARTICIPANTS

IMPACT	NUMBER
Enabled me to function more effectively	17
Made no appreciable difference	-
TOTAL	17

TABLE VIII

SINGLE GREATEST STRENGTH OF PROGRAM

AS PERCEIVED BY PARTICIPANTS

ITEM OF GREATEST VALUE	NUMBER
1. Opportunity to pursue unstructured study of problem of major concern to participant	12
2. The strength of the University staff and excellence of library resources	3
3. The opportunity to pool and share with other participants	2
4. The opportunity to interact with staff	1
5. The stimulation provided by staff members	1
TOTAL	19*

*Two respondents cited two strengths rather than one. Thus, the total exceeds, by two, the number of respondents.

TABLE IX

SINGLE GREATEST WEAKNESS OF PROGRAM

AS PERCEIVED BY PARTICIPANTS

	SINGLE GREATEST WEAKNESS	NUMBER
1.	Three weeks is too long for practicing school administrators	3
2.	Difficulty of finding needed staff members on campus	2
3.	Summary meeting (Monticello) should have been condensed with interaction in smaller groups	2
4.	Lack of time to prepare final position paper	2
5.	Lack of competent staff in area of special interest	1
6.	Staff tended to underate ability of practicing administrators	1
7.	Lack of preplanning by participants	1
8.	Limited opportunity for interaction with other participants	1
9.	Location of housing, lack of transportation	1
10.	Inability to start quickly due to lack of structure during first few days of program	1
	TOTAL	15*

*Two participants failed to identify any weaknesses in the program.

TABLE X

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVING THE ILLINOIS RESIDENT PROGRAM FOR FUTURE PARTICIPANTS

	SUGGESTIONS	FREQUENCY OF MENTION
1.	Provide for greater faculty accessibility and involvement	3
2.	Provide local transportation for participants	3
3.	Organize program into three one-week sessions or one two-week sessions	3
4.	Lengthen the program to four weeks	1
5.	Require three weeks of uninterrupted study	1
6.	Schedule all participants for the same time	1
7.	Structure the first few days of the program	1
8.	House all participants in same building or area	1
9.	Provide for more extensive graduate assistance	1
10.	Provide assistance to participants and/or eliminate final paper	1
11.	Draw participants from more diverse geographical areas	1
12.	Increase number of participants representing large districts	1
13.	Require exposure of particpants to more than one problem area	1
14.	Have participants share their problem and progress with one or more graduate classes	1
15.	Arrange for greater small group interaction in three-day summer conference	1
16.	Arrange for families to accompany participants in identifying University activities (plays, speakers, etc.) taking place on campus	1
17.	Arrange for reunion two years hence to assess impact of program	1

PART IV

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Value and purpose are the architects of an effective inservice program. They shape its organization, its content, and its design. The strength of any program lies in large part in the personal involvement of individuals, in the identity of their own interests and concerns with the program, in the opportunities it gives them to contribute ideas and viewpoints as well as to receive assistance, and in the ability and self-confidence it gives men and women to think for themselves and to act in an intelligent manner.

An effective inservice program will fall short of its highest purpose if it does not bring about changes in the understandings, the attitudes, and in the behavior of people. Education at any level or in any form is a personal matter. It involves people in a most intimate way if it is in keeping with the best known principles of teaching and learning. It conveys meanings; it gives assistance at points where needs are felt; it changes thoughts, beliefs, and actions; it is uniquely adapted to the problems and interests of individuals and gives full consideration to the circumstances in which they live and work.

It is this personal involvement at every point in a well-conceived inservice program to assist school administrators that makes cooperative planning so essential. Unless the institution of higher learning--in accepting the responsibility for providing an inservice program to a group of administrators--fully understands the concerns, interests,

and needs of the people whom it expects to serve, the program will have a superficial quality.

To move ahead in inservice education for school administrators in a manner that is comparable to the effort being made to add new dimensions of power to leadership capacities in other facets of the culture, objectives must be clearly stated, programs carefully delineated, and a financial plan developed to support the program. Such programs will be team operations in which there is flexibility and opportunity for individuals to make choices just as individuals choose the path they follow and the purposes they pursue in other facets of American life.

The program may be simple in its approach as it supports administrators in their efforts to do a better job day after day. The project evaluators know of commendable islands of inservice activity in many parts of the country. An island may be a university staff--such as that at the College of Education at the University of Illinois--alert to the challenge of this opportunity; it may be a state department of education eager to reach beyond its legislatively-mandated supervisory and implementation functions; or, it may be a regional or state association of administrators or an intergroup effort on a regional level.

Platitudes and clichés abound to support the thesis that everybody and every organization have a stake in improving the quality of public education. It is certainly true to put it negatively that "He who serves as his own lawyer has a fool for a client." It is also just as true, as Justice Holmes once wrote, that "General propositions do not decide concrete cases." Yet, somewhere between these polar opposites lies the problem of closing the gaps. Administrators' associations, preservice institutions, government--everyone has this common problem.

The project evaluators believe that colleges and universities have a responsibility for inservice preparation comparable to their responsibility for the preservice education of administrative leadership; that there is as great a challenge and opportunity for state departments to take up new tasks in on-the-job administrative upgrading as there is for the local administrator to go beyond mere administrative routine and operational detail in the organization and execution of faculty meetings and work conferences; that all professional organizations, proliferating in numbers and kind into specialties galore, have an exciting chance to join hands and move forward together in this new adventure; and that perhaps the key to unlocking a nationwide movement lies in the working together of the local superintendent and his board of education to lift all their sights to the true intellectual and emotional nature of leadership.

The growth of an individual or a body of individuals does not make any one different tomorrow or next year. Change is part of total change in the organism. It is adaptation and adjustment; it is not transmutation. Change is imperceptible at the time of its making, yet it becomes part of total growth effected into the individual while subtlely affecting all aspects and parts of the individual, thereby inducing change in previously unchanged parts of the organism. In this manner human change and growth seek to overcome lopsidedness and outcroppings.

Growth, therefore, is a process of becoming. It lies behind, beside, and beyond the individual. It is a restless mass of constant change, of creativity; it is what is happening to the individual as well as

what has happened to him. Change, we too often mistakenly believe, is what remains after the scaffolding of courses, seminars, retreats, workshops, or problem unit has been removed. Yet, in truth, change proceeds and moves into the structure while the scaffolding itself is rising. Take away the scaffold and what remains is a "finished" job which imperceptible continues to change through deterioration, thereby requiring constant maintenance simply to remain "finished." As it is with school buildings, so it is also with school administration.

Growth is also exhiliration, vitalization, and invigoration. This is to say that its process contains its own worth because it is satisfying to the individual in itself. By responding to the identification processes it finds its own values, thus rising above and beyond itself in its previous climate. Herein lies the magic whereby its own growth begets growth in other selves. And this is the beating heart of administration, receiving and giving in development and change.

Today, all America has its eyes on the goal of an educational program that will be adequate to the age and the problems confronting a dynamic culture. On a thousand different fronts new sources of energy are being put into a total endeavor to bring public education in every city, village, and hamlet in the land to the point where it can meet the challenges of this age.

The continuous education of school administrators is one of the crucial focal points if public education is to succeed. The ultimate test of usefulness of an inservice program for school administrators will be the extent to which it has brought about better schools--richer and more

varied opportunities for children to learn and grow, stronger and better prepared teachers, more flexible school plant facilities, and improvements at every point along the way toward the achievement of the education program that is wanted and needed in this day and age.

In a world that harbors growing numbers of people who are grasping for new knowledge and skills in reaching for higher ideals, the demands on all institutions that have responsibility for education and on the leaders in these institutions are unprecedented. Faith that reason and understanding will in the end subordinate and control coercive forces and enable mankind to live with dignity and in peace moves people in all walks of life to greater educational effort. Mediocrity in any aspect of the educational program can neither be tolerated nor afforded. There is increasing determination to reach higher standards and to provide the best possible educational opportunities for children, youth, and adults with all their varying interests and abilities. This is the goal the people strive to reach. This is the challenge to school administration. It is an awesome but exciting call to American education.

IN THE OPINION OF THE PROJECT EVALUATORS THE ILLINOIS RESIDENT PROGRAM FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP IS A COMMENDABLE EFFORT WORTHY OF EMULATION.

Appendix A
SAMPLE QUESTIONNAIRE

ILLINOIS RESIDENT PROGRAM FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

An External Evaluation

. Professional position at the time you participated in the program.

_____ _____ _____
(Position) (City) (State)

. Age (check one)

- ☐ Under age 25
- ☐ 25-29
- ☐ 30-34
- ☐ 35-39
- ☐ 40-44
- ☐ 45-49
- ☐ 50-54
- ☐ 55-59
- ☐ 60 +

3. Sex (check one)

- ☐ Male
- ☐ Female

4. Marital status (check one)

- ☐ Married
- ☐ Single
- ☐ Other

. Describe the adequacy of resources made available to you and the cooperation you received in pursuing your study. Check each item in the appropriate column.

FACTOR	Excellent	Good	Average	Unsatis-factory	Poor	N Opi
1. The cooperation I received from the faculty in the college of education was						
2. The cooperation I received from professors in other colleges and/or departments was						
3. Library resources in the area of my interest were						
4. Were there staff members with a high degree of competence in the area of your interest						
5. Generally, I felt the experiences I had at the University of Illinois were						
6. The opportunity to interact with						

6. In your opinion, was the three week Illinois program (check one)

- ☐ TOO LONG
- ☐ ABOUT RIGHT
- ☐ TOO SHORT

7. Generally speaking, did the Illinois program measure up to your expectations (check one)?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ No opinion

8. In your opinion what was the single greatest strength in the Illinois program?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

9. In your opinion what was the single greatest weakness in the Illinois program?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

10. Did the experience you had really make a difference? Did it enable you to do something or perhaps to do it more effectively than you might have (check one)?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Don't Know

11. If your answer to question #10 was "Yes", please describe how it made a difference.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

12. If you could reorganize, refocus, alter, or change the program in any way, what would you do to improve the program?

APPENDIX B

Questionnaires Completed by Participants

in the Illinois Resident Program for

Educational Leadership

ILLINOIS RESIDENT PROGRAM FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

An External Evaluation

1. Professional position at the time you participated in the program.
Director, Claims and Accounting
Division of Finance & Stat.,Supt. Public Inst. Springfield Illinois
(Position) (City) (State)

2. Age (check one)

- ☐ Under age 25
- ☐ 25-29
- ☐ 30-34
- ☐ 35-39
- ☐ 40-44
- ☒ 45-49
- ☐ 50-54
- ☐ 55-59
- ☐ 60 +

3. Sex (check one)

- ☒ Male
- ☐ Female

4. Marital status (check one)

- ☒ Married
- ☐ Single
- ☐ Other

5. Describe the adequacy of resources made available to you and the cooperation you received in pursuing your study. Check each item in the appropriate column.

FACTOR	Excellent	Good	Average	Unsatis-factory	Poor
1. The cooperation I received from the faculty in the college of education was	X				
2. The cooperation I received from professors in other colleges and/or departments was	X				
3. Library resources in the area of my interest were	X				
4. Were there staff members with a high degree of competence in the area of your interest			X		
5. Generally, I felt the experiences I had at the University of Illinois were		X			
6. The opportunity to interact with					

6. In your opinion, was the three week Illinois program (check one)

- [ ] TOO LONG
- [X] ABOUT RIGHT
- [ ] TOO SHORT

7. Generally speaking, did the Illinois program measure up to your expectations (check one)?

- [X] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] No opinion

8. In your opinion what was the single greatest strength in the Illinois program?

The opportunity to have time to do independent study.

9. In your opinion what was the single greatest weakness in the Illinois program?

The most knowledgeable professor in my area of study was at the University but one day during my three weeks on campus.

10. Did the experience you had really make a difference? Did it enable you to do something or perhaps to do it more effectively than you might have (check one)?

- [X] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Don't Know

11. If your answer to question #10 was "Yes", please describe how it made a difference

I did some reading, thinking, and writing that I needed to do. A valuable unexpected fringe benefit was the opportunity to participate in the joint meeting where presentations were made by each of the participants.

12. If you could reorganize, refocus, alter, or change the program in any way, what would you do to improve the program?

In my case, I was on campus three consecutive weeks. I now wish that I had attended three - one-week periods. I would also investigate who and what was scheduled at the university during my planned dates of attendance.

RECEIVED AASA
JUL 27 1970

ILLINOIS RESIDENT PROGRAM FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

An External Evaluation

1. Professional position at the time you participated in the program.

Maine Township High Schools, Dist. 207
Coord. of Pupil Personnel Services (Position) — Park Ridge, (City) — Illinois (State)

2. Age (check one)

- ☐ Under age 25
- ☐ 25-29
- ☐ 30-34
- ☐ 35-39
- ☐ 40-44
- ☐ 45-49
- ☐ 50-54
- ☒ 55-59
- ☐ 60 +

3. Sex (check one)

- ☒ Male
- ☐ Female

4. Marital status (check one)

- ☐ Married
- ☒ Single
- ☐ Other

5. Describe the adequacy of resources made available to you and the cooperation you received in pursuing your study. Check each item in the appropriate colum

FACTOR	Excellent	Good	Average	Unsatis-factory	Poor
1. The cooperation I received from the faculty in the college of education was	xx				
2. The cooperation I received from professors in other colleges and/or departments was		xx			
3. Library resources in the area of my interest were			xx		
4. Were there staff members with a high degree of competence in the area of your interest			xx		
5. Generally, I felt the experiences I had at the University of Illinois were		xx			
6. The opportunity to interact with		xx			

6. In your opinion, was the three week Illinois program (check one)

- [ ] TOO LONG
- [X] ABOUT RIGHT
- [ ] TOO SHORT

7. Generally speaking, did the Illinois program measure up to your expectations (check one)?

- [X] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] No opinion

8. In your opinion what was the single greatest strength in the Illinois program?

The get-together at Monticello where everyone got the chance to interact.

9. In your opinion what was the single greatest weakness in the Illinois program?

Got off to a slow start. I think that in a short three week program it might be best to have the first couple of days structured. There seemed to be a little of "feeling your way" by all concerned.

10. Did the experience you had really make a difference? Did it enable you to do something or perhaps to do it more effectively than you might have (check one)?

- [X] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Don't Know

11. If your answer to question #10 was "Yes", please describe how it made a difference.

I would have never have found the time to sort out ideas and to collate them into a position paper if it hadn't been for this experience. The exposure to certain individuals was of real worth to me in giving me direction and support.

12. If you could reorganize, refocus, alter, or change the program in any way, what would you do to improve the program?

Answered somewhat in No. #9.

I would take more advantage of those in the program while on the campus by having graduate classes hear these people and explore with them the problem undertaken. Sitting in on classes was fine but not good enough. I think these visitors from all over the country could do much to add strenghh to classes on campus by having an informal discussion. This I would formally structure into the program.

Merlin ".Schultz

ILLINOIS RESIDENT PROGRAM FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

RECEIVED
JUL 23 1970

An External Evaluation

1. Professional position at the time you participated in the program.

Director of Sp. Ed. (Position) Kansas City (City) Kansas (State)

2. Age (check one)

- ☐ Under age 25
- ☐ 25-29
- ☐ 30-34
- ☐ 35-39
- ☑ 40-44
- ☐ 45-49
- ☐ 50-54
- ☐ 55-59
- ☐ 60 +

3. Sex (check one)

- ☑ Male
- ☐ Female

4. Marital status (check one)

- ☑ Married
- ☐ Single
- ☐ Other

5. Describe the adequacy of resources made available to you and the cooperation you received in pursuing your study. Check each item in the appropriate column.

FACTOR	Excellent	Good	Average	Unsatis-factory	Poor	No Opinion
1. The cooperation I received from the faculty in the college of education was	✓					
2. The cooperation I received from professors in other colleges and/or departments was	✓					
3. Library resources in the area of my interest were	✓					
4. Were there staff members with a high degree of competence in the area of your interest		✓				
5. Generally, I felt the experiences I had at the University of Illinois were	✓					
6. The opportunity to interact with other advanced graduate students	✓					

6. In your opinion, was the three week Illinois program (check one)

- [x] TOO LONG
- [ ] ABOUT RIGHT
- [ ] TOO SHORT

7. Generally speaking, did the Illinois program measure up to your expectations (check one)?

- [x] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] No opinion

8. In your opinion what was the single greatest strength in the Illinois program?

A big fine for individual research

9. In your opinion what was the single greatest weakness in the Illinois program?

Length of Seminar was too long. Could have accomplished desired purpose in short time. Although seminar was great, it could have been shorter.

10. Did the experience you had really make a difference? Did it enable you to do something or perhaps to do it more effectively than you might have (check one)?

- [x] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Don't Know

11. If your answer to question #10 was "Yes", please describe how it made a difference.

Time provided for research of materials. Contacts provided by Educ. Res. Dept. were very worthwhile.

12. If you could reorganize, refocus, alter, or change the program in any way, what would you do to improve the program?

I. One two week stay

II One One week stay (1 at a time preferably, Two weeks later)

III Shorten Session

JUL 22 1970

ILLINOIS RESIDENT PROGRAM FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

An External Evaluation

1. Professional position at the time you participated in the program.

Supt. of Schools (Position) | Geneva (City) | Illinois (State)

2. Age (check one)

- ☐ Under age 25
- ☐ 25-29
- ☐ 30-34
- ☐ 35-39
- ☐ 40-44
- ☒ 45-49
- ☐ 50-54
- ☐ 55-59
- ☐ 60 +

3. Sex (check one)

- ☒ Male
- ☐ Female

4. Marital status (check one)

- ☒ Married
- ☐ Single
- ☐ Other

5. Describe the adequacy of resources made available to you and the cooperation you received in pursuing your study. Check each item in the appropriate column.

FACTOR	Excellent	Good	Average	Unsatis-factory	Poor	No Opinion
1. The cooperation I received from the faculty in the college of education was	X					
2. The cooperation I received from professors in other colleges and/or departments was		X				
3. Library resources in the area of my interest were	X					
4. Were there staff members with a high degree of competence in the area of your interest		X				
5. Generally, I felt the experiences I had at the University of Illinois were	X					
6. The opportunity to interact with other advanced graduate students		X				

JUL 22 1970

6. In your opinion, was the three week Illinois program (check one)

- [ ] TOO LONG
- [X] ABOUT RIGHT
- [ ] TOO SHORT

7. Generally speaking, did the Illinois program measure up to your expectations (check one)?

- [X] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] No opinion

8. In your opinion what was the single greatest strength in the Illinois program?

FLEXIBLE FORMAT ALLOWED REAL-
INDEPENDENCE. UNIVERSITY RESOURCES
COULD BE TAPPED TO MAKE THAT
INDEPENDENCE YIELD RESULTS

9. In your opinion what was the single greatest weakness in the Illinois program?

FROM THE PARTICIPATS POINT OF VIEW
UNIVERSITY PEOPLE UNDER RATED PEOPLE
FROM THE FIELD. IF CONTACT DIMINISHED
THEIR FEELING WE DON'T KNOW WHAT
WE ARE DOING THIS MAY BE A STRENGTH

0. Did the experience you had really make a difference? Did it enable you to do something or perhaps to do it more effectively than you might have (check one)?

- [X] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Don't Know

1. If your answer to question #10 was "Yes", please describe how it made a difference.

I WAS ABLE TO WORK ON LOCAL
PROBLEMS IN A BROADER AND MORE
EFFECTIVE CONTEXT. I HAVE CHANGED
THE WEIGHT I HAD BEEN GIVING
TO SOME KINDS OF BASIC DATA
FOR DECISION MAKING

12. If you could reorganize, refocus, alter, or change the program in any way, what would you do to improve the program?

I DON'T FEEL I KNOW ENOUGH ABOUT THE UNIVERSITY PLANS AND PROCEDURES TO COMMENT. I WOULD MAKE SOME CHANGES IN MY OWN PROCEDURE MOSTLY DESIGNED TO CAPTURE MORE INTEREST AND GET MORE EVALUATIVE JUDGMENT AS AGAINST CUES AND SUGGESTIONS FROM UNIVERSITY SPECIALISTS

ILLINOIS RESIDENT PROGRAM FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

An External Evaluation

1. Professional position at the time you participated in the program.

Personnel Administrator	Santa Barbara	California
(Position)	(City)	(State)

2. Age (check one)

- ☐ Under age 25
- ☐ 25-29
- ☐ 30-34
- ☐ 35-39
- ☐ 40-44
- ☐ 45-49
- ☐ 50-54
- ☐ 55-59
- ☐ 60 +

3. Sex (check one)

- ☒ Male
- ☐ Female

4. Marital status (check one)

- ☒ Married
- ☐ Single
- ☐ Other

5. Describe the adequacy of resources made available to you and the cooperation you received in pursuing your study. Check each item in the appropriate column.

FACTOR	Excellent	Good	Average	Unsatis-factory	Poor	No Op
1. The cooperation I received from the faculty in the college of education was	X					
2. The cooperation I received from professors in other colleges and/or departments was	X					
3. Library resources in the area of my interest were		X				
4. Were there staff members with a high degree of competence in the area of your interest		X				
5. Generally, I felt the experiences I had at the University of Illinois were	X					
6. The opportunity to interact with			X			

6. In your opinion, was the three week Illinois program (check one)

- [ ] TOO LONG
- [X] ABOUT RIGHT
- [ ] TOO SHORT

7. Generally speaking, did the Illinois program measure up to your expectations (check one)?

- [X] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] No opinion

8. In your opinion what was the single greatest strength in the Illinois program?

The unstructured, unencumbered research topic and material project

9. In your opinion what was the single greatest weakness in the Illinois program?

Housing location was too far from the campus, isolated from other Illinois Resident Fellows, and no provisions for transportation so as to visit, interview and conduct dialogue with leaders in the field.

10. Did the experience you had really make a difference? Did it enable you to do something or perhaps to do it more effectively than you might have (check one)?

- [X] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Don't Know

11. If your answer to question #10 was "Yes", please describe how it made a differe

By meeting with persons (School of Industrial Relations) who had much to offer in negotiations as a result of their wide experience in labor, I was able to share vicariously their experiences and decision making became more meaningful.

12. If you could reorganize, refocus, alter, or change the program in any way, what would you do to improve the program?

1. House all persons in the same unit

2. Establish weekly sessions for dialogue with colleagues and staff

3. Have transportation available for visitations and field work

4. Provide listing of educational activities being sponsored within/stat

5. Provide for a follow-up reunion 2-3 years hence.

ILLINOIS RESIDENT PROGRAM FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

JUL 20 1970

An External Evaluation

1. Professional position at the time you participated in the program.

Asst. Supt. (Position) Raeford (City), N.C. (State)

2. Age (check one)

- ☐ Under age 25
- ☐ 25-29
- ☐ 30-34
- ☒ 35-39
- ☐ 40-44
- ☐ 45-49
- ☐ 50-54
- ☐ 55-59
- ☐ 60 +

3. Sex (check one)

- ☒ Male
- ☐ Female

4. Marital status (check one)

- ☒ Married
- ☐ Single
- ☐ Other

5. Describe the adequacy of resources made available to you and the cooperation you received in pursuing your study. Check each item in the appropriate column.

FACTOR	Excellent	Good	Average	Unsatis-factory	Poor	No Opinion
1. The cooperation I received from the faculty in the college of education was	✓					
2. The cooperation I received from professors in other colleges and/or departments was	✓					
3. Library resources in the area of my interest were	✓					
4. Were there staff members with a high degree of competence in the area of your interest		✓				
5. Generally, I felt the experiences I had at the University of Illinois were	✓					
6. The opportunity to interact with		✓				

6. In your opinion, was the three week Illinois program (check one)

- [ ] TOO LONG
- [ ] ABOUT RIGHT
- [x] TOO SHORT

7. Generally speaking, did the Illinois program measure up to your expectations (check one)?

- [x] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] No opinion

8. In your opinion what was the single greatest strength in the Illinois program?

The program with a wide [illegible] content

9. In your opinion what was the single greatest weakness in the Illinois program?

Lack of time to [illegible] the [illegible] content [illegible] the [illegible]

10. Did the experience you had really make a difference? Did it enable you to do something or perhaps to do it more effectively than you might have (check one)?

- [x] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Don't Know

11. If your answer to question #10 was "Yes", please describe how it made a difference.

It was [illegible] I could [illegible] in my [illegible] with [illegible] positive [illegible]

12. If you could reorganize, refocus, alter, or change the program in any way, what would you do to improve the program?

ILLINOIS RESIDENT PROGRAM FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

An External Evaluation

1. Professional position at the time you participated in the program.

Supt. of Schools (Position) — Sparland, Illinois (City) (State)

2. Age (check one)

- ☐ Under age 25
- ☐ 25-29
- ☐ 30-34
- ☐ 35-39
- ☑ 40-44
- ☐ 45-49
- ☐ 50-54
- ☐ 55-59
- ☐ 60 +

3. Sex (check one)

- ☑ Male
- ☐ Female

4. Marital status (check one)

- ☑ Married
- ☐ Single
- ☐ Other

5. Describe the adequacy of resources made available to you and the cooperation you received in pursuing your study. Check each item in the appropriate column.

FACTOR	Excellent	Good	Average	Unsatis-factory	Poor	N Opi
1. The cooperation I received from the faculty in the college of education was		✓				
2. The cooperation I received from professors in other colleges and/or departments was						
3. Library resources in the area of my interest were		✓				
4. Were there staff members with a high degree of competence in the area of your interest	✓					
5. Generally, I felt the experiences I had at the University of Illinois were	✓					
6. The opportunity to interact with other advanced graduate students	✓					

6. In your opinion, was the three week Illinois program (check one)

- [ ] TOO LONG
- [ ] ABOUT RIGHT
- [x] TOO SHORT

7. Generally speaking, did the Illinois program measure up to your expectations (check one)?

- [x] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] No opinion

8. In your opinion what was the single greatest strength in the Illinois program?

the opportunity to do an "in depth" study on a topic of interest in a proper "atmosphere"

9. In your opinion what was the single greatest weakness in the Illinois program?

None

10. Did the experience you had really make a difference? Did it enable you to do something or perhaps to do it more effectively than you might have (check one)?

- [x] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Don't Know

11. If your answer to question #10 was "Yes", please describe how it made a difference.

I have become much more aware of the "pros and cons" of my subject (PPBS). Although my present district is too small to implement such a program it has produced much "direction" for my continuation of the topic in preparation of a future position.

12. If you could reorganize, refocus, alter, or change the program in any way, what would you do to improve the program?

If it were possible for the group to be on campus the same three weeks much benefit could be derived from exchange of ideas from the people in the program. In our final week when all were together many excellent comments were made by these people. Perhaps this was due to the top quality of the people selected for the program.

Otherwise - I think the program was great!

Much credit should be given to Dr Miller, Dr Sergiovanni, and the graduated assistants for an excellent job of leadership.

P.R. Dardano

ILLINOIS RESIDENT PROGRAM FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

An External Evaluation

1. Professional position at the time you participated in the program.

Supt — McHenry — Ill
(Position) (City) (State)

2. Age (check one)

- ☐ Under age 25
- ☐ 25-29
- ☐ 30-34
- ☐ 35-39
- ☒ 40-44
- ☐ 45-49
- ☐ 50-54
- ☐ 55-59
- ☐ 60 +

3. Sex (check one)

- ☒ Male
- ☐ Female

4. Marital status (check one)

- ☒ Married
- ☐ Single
- ☐ Other

5. Describe the adequacy of resources made available to you and the cooperation you received in pursuing your study. Check each item in the appropriate column

FACTOR	Excellent	Good	Average	Unsatis-factory	Poor
1. The cooperation I received from the faculty in the college of education was	X				
2. The cooperation I received from professors in other colleges and/or departments was		X			
3. Library resources in the area of my interest were			X		
4. Were there staff members with a high degree of competence in the area of your interest	X				
5. Generally, I felt the experiences I had at the University of Illinois were		X			
6. The opportunity to interact with other advanced graduate students was		X			

6. In your opinion, was the three week Illinois program (check one)

- [ ] TOO LONG
- [x] ABOUT RIGHT
- [ ] TOO SHORT

7. Generally speaking, did the Illinois program measure up to your expectations (check one)?

- [x] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] No opinion

8. In your opinion what was the single greatest strength in the Illinois program?

program was greatly self structured and self enhancing.

9. In your opinion what was the single greatest weakness in the Illinois program?

more pre-planning prior to the visit could have been obtained

10. Did the experience you had really make a difference? Did it enable you to do something or perhaps to do it more effectively than you might have (check one)?

- [x] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Don't Know

11. If your answer to question #10 was "Yes", please describe how it made a difference

It deepened my commitment, confi and knowledge in the program selected.

12. If you could reorganize, refocus, alter, or change the program in any way, what would you do to improve the program?

Perhaps have the profs do more individual planning and follow-up to train the graduate assistants.

JUL 20

ILLINOIS RESIDENT PROGRAM FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

An External Evaluation

1. Professional position at the time you participated in the program.

_____ _____ _____
(Position) (City) (State)

2. Age (check one)

- ☐ Under age 25
- ☐ 25-29
- ☐ 30-34
- ☐ 35-39
- ☑ 40-44
- ☐ 45-49
- ☐ 50-54
- ☐ 55-59
- ☐ 60 +

3. Sex (check one)

- ☑ Male
- ☐ Female

4. Marital status (check one)

- ☑ Married
- ☐ Single
- ☐ Other

5. Describe the adequacy of resources made available to you and the cooperation you received in pursuing your study. Check <u>each</u> item in the appropriate column.

FACTOR	Excellent	Good	Average	Unsatis-factory	Poor
1. The cooperation I received from the faculty in the college of education was	✓				
2. The cooperation I received from professors in other colleges and/or departments was	✓				
3. Library resources in the area of my interest were	✓				
4. Were there staff members with a high degree of competence in the area of your interest		✓			
5. Generally, I felt the experiences I had at the University of Illinois were	✓				
6. The opportunity to interact with other advanced graduate students was		✓			

6. In your opinion, was the three week Illinois program (check one)

- [ ] TOO LONG
- [x] ABOUT RIGHT
- [ ] TOO SHORT

7. Generally speaking, did the Illinois program measure up to your expectations (check one)?

- [x] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] No opinion

8. In your opinion what was the single greatest strength in the Illinois program?

The opportunity to devote a block of time to one concern.

9. In your opinion what was the single greatest weakness in the Illinois program?

3 weeks is about right for such a study - perhaps even more time could be allowed - however, 3 weeks is too long to be away from the family

10. Did the experience you had really make a difference? Did it enable you to do something or perhaps to do it more effectively than you might have (check one)?

- [x] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Don't Know

11. If your answer to question #10 was "Yes", please describe how it made a difference

Provided for in depth study that otherwise would not have been possible

12. If you could reorganize, refocus, alter, or change the program in any way, what would you do to improve the program?

Arrange for families to join participants

JUL 29 1974

ILLINOIS RESIDENT PROGRAM FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

An External Evaluation

1. Professional position at the time you participated in the program.

Elem. School Principal, Manhasset, N. Y.
(Position) (City) (State)

2. Age (check one)

- ☐ Under age 25
- ☐ 25-29
- ☐ 30-34
- ☐ 35-39
- ☐ 40-44
- ☑ 45-49
- ☐ 50-54
- ☐ 55-59
- ☐ 60 +

3. Sex (check one)

- ☑ Male
- ☐ Female

4. Marital status (check one)

- ☑ Married
- ☐ Single
- ☐ Other

5. Describe the adequacy of resources made available to you and the cooperation you received in pursuing your study. Check each item in the appropriate column.

FACTOR	Excellent	Good	Average	Unsatis-factory	Poor	Op
1. The cooperation I received from the faculty in the college of education was	✓					
2. The cooperation I received from professors in other colleges and/or departments was		✓				
3. Library resources in the area of my interest were	✓					
4. Were there staff members with a high degree of competence in the area of your interest	✓					
5. Generally, I felt the experiences I had at the University of Illinois were	✓					
6. The opportunity to interact with other advanced graduate students was		✓				

6. In your opinion, was the three week Illinois program (check one)

- [ ] TOO LONG
- [x] ABOUT RIGHT
- [ ] TOO SHORT

7. Generally speaking, did the Illinois program measure up to your expectations (check one)?

- [x] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] No opinion

8. In your opinion what was the single greatest strength in the Illinois program?

Excellent resources available on the U. of Ill. campus plus surrounding school districts.

9. In your opinion what was the single greatest weakness in the Illinois program?

The lack of time to prepare adequate "position paper(s)" after the three-week period spent on campus.

10. Did the experience you had really make a difference? Did it enable you to do something or perhaps to do it more effectively than you might have (check one)?

- [x] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Don't Know

11. If your answer to question #10 was "Yes", please describe how it made a difference.

I believe I am much more knowledgable regarding recent developments relating to my topic of interest - In addition, recommendations made in my paper will be utilized by my school district.

12. If you could reorganize, refocus, alter, or change the program in any way, what would you do to improve the program?

Perhaps offer time and assistance to participants during the three week capstone experience that least requires an outline for their papers.

ILLINOIS RESIDENT PROGRAM FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

An External Evaluation

1. Professional position at the time you participated in the program.

SUPT. (Position) HINSDALE (City) ILLINOIS (State)

2. Age (check one)

- ☐ Under age 25
- ☐ 25-29
- ☐ 30-34
- ☒ 35-39
- ☐ 40-44
- ☐ 45-49
- ☐ 50-54
- ☐ 55-59
- ☐ 60 +

3. Sex (check one)

- ☒ Male
- ☐ Female

4. Marital status (check one)

- ☒ Married
- ☐ Single
- ☐ Other

5. Describe the adequacy of resources made available to you and the cooperatio you received in pursuing your study. Check each item in the appropriate co

FACTOR	Excellent	Good	Average	Unsatis-factory	
1. The cooperation I received from the faculty in the college of education was	X				
2. The cooperation I received from professors in other colleges and/or departments was	X				
3. Library resources in the area of my interest were	X				
4. Were there staff members with a high degree of competence in the area of your interest	X				
5. Generally, I felt the experiences I had at the University of Illinois were	X				

6. In your opinion, was the three week Illinois program (check one)

- ☐ TOO LONG
- ☒ ABOUT RIGHT
- ☐ TOO SHORT

7. Generally speaking, did the Illinois program measure up to your expectations (check one)?

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ No opinion

8. In your opinion what was the single greatest strength in the Illinois program?

The wealth of professional manpower in all colleges staff-fowlers willing and available to assist. A concentration of talent that is known by and difficult to come by otherwise on a campus-wide basis.

9. In your opinion what was the single greatest weakness in the Illinois program?

The requirement that somehow involved in this form for a paper was made necessary part of participation in the program.

10. Did the experience you had really make a difference? Did it enable you to do something or perhaps to do it more effectively than you might have (check one)?

- ☒ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ Don't Know

11. If your answer to question #10 was "Yes", please describe how it made a difference.

It enabled me to refine my ideas about administrative structure and design an evaluation program, examine materials and establish priorities for development in my own district.

12. If you could reorganize, refocus, alter, or change the program in any way, what would you do to improve the program?

I would make it mandatory to study on the Campus for three consecutive weeks and not fall out any breaks. There would be no provisions for signs and textbook sales, unless the participants were self-lined. A statement of progress would be graded to each participant for efforts during the three week period while in training. If some of these items would not be met all of the Basic Work aspects of the program.

I think the program was to Members asset to me. I was very grateful & to be accepted into the program.

ILLINOIS RESIDENT PROGRAM FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

An External Evaluation

1. Professional position at the time you participated in the program.

Superintendent — Jacksonville — Illinois
(Position) (City) (State)

2. Age (check one)

- ☐ Under age 25
- ☐ 25-29
- ☐ 30-34
- ☐ 35-39
- ☒ 40-44
- ☐ 45-49
- ☐ 50-54
- ☐ 55-59
- ☐ 60 +

3. Sex (check one)

- ☒ Male
- ☐ Female

4. Marital status (check one)

- ☑ Married
- ☐ Single
- ☐ Other

5. Describe the adequacy of resources made available to you and the cooperation you received in pursuing your study. Check each item in the appropriate column.

FACTOR	Excellent	Good	Average	Unsatis-factory	Poor	No Opinio
1. The cooperation I received from the faculty in the college of education was	X					
2. The cooperation I received from professors in other colleges and/or departments was		X				
3. Library resources in the area of my interest were		X				
4. Were there staff members with a high degree of competence in the area of your interest	X					
5. Generally, I felt the experiences I had at the University of Illinois were	X					
6. The opportunity to interact with						

6. In your opinion, was the three week Illinois program (check one)

- [ ] TOO LONG
- [X] ABOUT RIGHT
- [ ] TOO SHORT

7. Generally speaking, did the Illinois program measure up to your expectations (check one)?

- [X] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] No opinion

8. In your opinion what was the single greatest strength in the Illinois program?

The opportunity to be on the campus of a major university and to have free access to the library and personal resources. Perhaps the greatest [illegible] was to talk administrative theory with professors and graduate students.

9. In your opinion what was the single greatest weakness in the Illinois program?

There were no major weaknesses in my opinion. Occasionally it was a little difficult to see certain professors, but this was because of their full schedules. All were most courteous and helpful once contact was established.

10. Did the experience you had really make a difference? Did it enable you to do something or perhaps to do it more effectively than you might have (check one)?

- [X] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Don't Know

11. If your answer to question #10 was "Yes", please describe how it made a difference

I learned of a theory in negotiation that contrasts with the conflict-adversary theory. I am using this theory in my thinking as I endeavor to [illegible] in negotiations. The theory, incidentally, is the Integrative Theory of negotiations, usually well known

professional negotiations -3-

12. If you could reorganize, refocus, alter, or change the program in any way, what would you do to improve the program?

Emphasize almost completely the time on campus. The wrap-up conference was excellent, and it was great to see all who had participated, but perhaps the functions of the conference could be saved for in some way while participants were on campus.

Two or three others in the program who were in Champaign without automobiles said it was a disadvantage to be housed off-campus. Perhaps the program could be improved by assuring that all participants would live on campus.

ILLINOIS RESIDENT PROGRAM FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

An External Evaluation

1. Professional position at the time you participated in the program.

Director of Curriculum and Instructional Services (Position) Evanston (City) Public Schools (State)

Evanst
Illino

2. Age (check one)

- ☐ Under age 25
- ☐ 25-29
- ☐ 30-34
- ☒ 35-39
- ☐ 40-44
- ☐ 45-49
- ☐ 50-54
- ☐ 55-59
- ☐ 60 +

3. Sex (check one)

- ☒ Male
- ☐ Female

4. Marital status (check one)

- ☒ Married
- ☐ Single
- ☐ Other

5. Describe the adequacy of resources made available to you and the cooperation you received in pursuing your study. Check each item in the appropriate column.

FACTOR	Excellent	Good	Average	Unsatis-factory	Poor	Op
1. The cooperation I received from the faculty in the college of education was	X					
2. The cooperation I received from professors in other colleges and/or departments was	X					
3. Library resources in the area of my interest were		X				
4. Were there staff members with a high degree of competence in the area of your interest	X					
5. Generally, I felt the experiences I had at the University of Illinois were	X					

6. In your opinion, was the three week Illinois program (check one)

- [ ] TOO LONG
- [x] ABOUT RIGHT
- [ ] TOO SHORT

7. Generally speaking, did the Illinois program measure up to your expectations (check one)?

- [x] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] No opinion

8. In your opinion what was the single greatest strength in the Illinois program?

I had the opportunity to study the topics of concern to me in a new light away from the hectic demands of time on the job and within an atmosphere of "philosophy" that was most helpful to me.

9. In your opinion what was the single greatest weakness in the Illinois program?

During the three day conferences in June I would have preferred smaller group sessions. I did not enjoy having to interact with 20-30 persons around the large table.

10. Did the experience you had really make a difference? Did it enable you to do something or perhaps to do it more effectively than you might have (check one)?

- [x] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Don't Know

11. If your answer to question #10 was "Yes", please describe how it made a difference.

Because of this experience I developed an entirely different outlook on my job and a new approach to my duties. As a result of this experience our district has embarked upon some

12. If you could reorganize, refocus, alter, or change the program in any way, what would you do to improve the program?

I would change the format of the three day summer conference. I would certainly retain this conference but I would allow for additional small group interaction.

For me, this was a splendid educational experience.

ILLINOIS RESIDENT PROGRAM FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

An External Evaluation

1. Professional position at the time you participated in the program.

[redacted] (Position) [redacted] (City) [redacted] (State)

2. Age (check one)

- ☐ Under age 25
- ☐ 25-29
- ☐ 30-34
- ☐ 35-39
- ☒ 40-44
- ☐ 45-49
- ☐ 50-54
- ☐ 55-59
- ☐ 60 +

3. Sex (check one)

- ☒ Male
- ☐ Female

4. Marital status (check one)

- ☒ Married
- ☐ Single
- ☐ Other

5. Describe the adequacy of resources made available to you and the cooperation you received in pursuing your study. Check each item in the appropriate column.

FACTOR	Excellent	Good	Average	Unsatis-factory	Poor	No Opinio
1. The cooperation I received from the faculty in the college of education was		X				
2. The cooperation I received from professors in other colleges and/or departments was		X				
3. Library resources in the area of my interest were			X			
4. Were there staff members with a high degree of competence in the area of your interest		X				
5. Generally, I felt the experiences I had at the University of Illinois were		X				
6. The opportunity to interact with			X			

6. In your opinion, was the three week Illinois program (check one)

- [ ] TOO LONG
- [x] ABOUT RIGHT
- [ ] TOO SHORT

7. Generally speaking, did the Illinois program measure up to your expectations (check one)?

- [x] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] No opinion

8. In your opinion what was the single greatest strength in the Illinois program?

The opportunity to pursue an individual basis an interest pertaining chosen by the participant because of its relevance to the participants after the "parking and shining" with other participants in the Time "recording".

9. In your opinion what was the single greatest weakness in the Illinois program?

Very little information sent to you, and no [illegible] Illinois outside [illegible] Chicago; but except [illegible] the faculty and materials available was appropriate and relevant.

10. Did the experience you had really make a difference? Did it enable you to do something or perhaps to do it more effectively than you might have (check one)?

- [x] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Don't Know

11. If your answer to question #10 was "Yes", please describe how it made a difference.

It provided time to study in depth the problem selected. It is rare when I can spend time a few weeks on one problem. The program allowed me to just dig [illegible] and interest to the [illegible] of [illegible].

12. If you could reorganize, refocus, alter, or change the program in any way, what would you do to improve the program?

- Don't limit to specific concept.
- A similar experimental component could enhance the "Library and Library" - but as much explanation of problem areas - little personal instruction for large organizations of four larger children.

ILLINOIS RESIDENT PROGRAM FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

An External Evaluation

1. Professional position at the time you participated in the program.

Superintendent — (Position)
South Holland — (City)
Illinois — (State)

2. Age (check one)

- ☐ Under age 25
- ☐ 25-29
- ☐ 30-34
- ☐ 35-39
- ☐ 40-44
- ☒ 45-49
- ☐ 50-54
- ☐ 55-59
- ☐ 60 +

3. Sex (check one)

- ☒ Male
- ☐ Female

4. Marital status (check one)

- ☒ Married
- ☐ Single
- ☐ Other

5. Describe the adequacy of resources made available to you and the cooperation you received in pursuing your study. Check each item in the appropriate column.

FACTOR	Excellent	Good	Average	Unsatis-factory	Poor	No Opinion
1. The cooperation I received from the faculty in the college of education was	✓					
2. The cooperation I received from professors in other colleges and/or departments was	✓					
3. Library resources in the area of my interest were	✓					
4. Were there staff members with a high degree of competence in the area of your interest	yes ✓					
5. Generally, I felt the experiences I had at the University of Illinois were	✓					
6. The opportunity to interact with other advanced graduate students was	✓					

6. In your opinion, was the three week Illinois program (check one)

- [ ] TOO LONG
- [x] ABOUT RIGHT
- [ ] TOO SHORT

7. Generally speaking, did the Illinois program measure up to your expectations (check one)?

- [x] Yes beyond it
- [ ] No
- [ ] No opinion

8. In your opinion what was the single greatest strength in the Illinois program?

Ability to direct my own interests & areas of need toward my own program to resolve my particular problems arising out of basic ordered desegregation

9. In your opinion what was the single greatest weakness in the Illinois program?

Last summing up meetings could have been condensed into two days

10. Did the experience you had really make a difference? Did it enable you to do something or perhaps to do it more effectively than you might have (check one)?

- [x] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Don't Know

I now have a task force working on our problems with VI Hdqs

11. If your answer to question #10 was "Yes", please describe how it made a difference.

12. If you could reorganize, refocus, alter, or change the program in any way, what would you do to improve the program?

Nothing - make it available again to me!

RECEIVED AASA
JUL 27 1970

ILLINOIS RESIDENT PROGRAM FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

An External Evaluation

1. Professional position at the time you participated in the program.

Director of Instructional Services (Position) Wilmette (City) Ill (State)

2. Age (check one)

- ☐ Under age 25
- ☐ 25-29
- ☒ 30-34
- ☐ 35-39
- ☐ 40-44
- ☐ 45-49
- ☐ 50-54
- ☐ 55-59
- ☐ 60 +

3. Sex (check one)

- ☒ Male
- ☐ Female

4. Marital status (check one)

- ☒ Married
- ☐ Single
- ☐ Other

5. Describe the adequacy of resources made available to you and the cooperation you received in pursuing your study. Check each item in the appropriate column.

FACTOR	Excellent	Good	Average	Unsatis-factory	Poor	N Opi
1. The cooperation I received from the faculty in the college of education was		X				
2. The cooperation I received from professors in other colleges and/or departments was		X				
3. Library resources in the area of my interest were		X				
4. Were there staff members with a high degree of competence in the area of your interest		X				
5. Generally, I felt the experiences I had at the University of Illinois were		X				
6. The opportunity to interact with	X					

6. In your opinion, was the three week Illinois program (check one)

[X] TOO LONG — to be away from job in one stretch
[ ] ABOUT RIGHT
[X] TOO SHORT - to get job done completely

7. Generally speaking, did the Illinois program measure up to your expectations (check one)?

[X] Yes
[ ] No
[ ] No opinion

8. In your opinion what was the single greatest strength in the Illinois program?

Gave an opportunity to have time and resources to get at a task. Could have used more time to complete it.

9. In your opinion what was the single greatest weakness in the Illinois program?

Had to be away from job too long in one stretch. Would prefer a four week program --- one week every quarter.

10. Did the experience you had really make a difference? Did it enable you to do something or perhaps to do it more effectively than you might have (check one)?

[X] Yes
[ ] No
[ ] Don't Know

11. If your answer to question #10 was "Yes", please describe how it made a difference.

Provided time to develop a program which has been submitted to a local University for consideration.

12. If you could reorganize, refocus, alter, or change the program in any way, what would you do to improve the program?

1. See #9.
2. Bring the participants together in one place (for living accomodations) so that there could be more interaction among them (evening and weekend).
3. Provide an outline of activities available to the participants - this may have been done later in the year.
4. Provide graduate assistance to really get the job done. Graduate assistants were helpful but gave superficial help only.
5. Some of these suggestions may have been implemented as the year progressed. I was the first person in the program and several of these items were discussed with the program directors in October.

Overall - a very worthwhile experience.

RECEIVED AASA
AUG -3 1970

ILLINOIS RESIDENT PROGRAM FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

An External Evaluation

1. Professional position at the time you participated in the program.

Asst. Supt. (Position) — Cuba (City) — Illinois (State)

2. Age (check one)

- ☐ Under age 25
- ☐ 25-29
- ☐ 30-34
- ☐ 35-39
- ☐ 40-44
- ☒ 45-49
- ☐ 50-54
- ☐ 55-59
- ☐ 60 +

3. Sex (check one)

- ☒ Male
- ☐ Female

4. Marital status (check one)

- ☒ Married
- ☐ Single
- ☐ Other

5. Describe the adequacy of resources made available to you and the cooperation you received in pursuing your study. Check each item in the appropriate column.

FACTOR	Excellent	Good	Average	Unsatis-factory	Poor	O
1. The cooperation I received from the faculty in the college of education was	✓					
2. The cooperation I received from professors in other colleges and/or departments was	✓					
3. Library resources in the area of my interest were	✓					
4. Were there staff members with a high degree of competence in the area of your interest				No one was chal yet.		
5. Generally, I felt the experiences I had at the University of Illinois were	✓					
6. The opportunity to interact with						

6. In your opinion, was the three week Illinois program (check one)

- [ ] TOO LONG
- [x] ABOUT RIGHT
- [ ] TOO SHORT

7. Generally speaking, did the Illinois program measure up to your expectations (check one)?

- [x] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] No opinion

8. In your opinion what was the single greatest strength in the Illinois program?

A opinion book was provided by the University staff which aided one in delving into a topic of concern.

9. In your opinion what was the single greatest weakness in the Illinois program?

10. Did the experience you had really make a difference? Did it enable you to do something or perhaps to do it more effectively than you might have (check one)?

- [x] Yes
- [ ] No
- [ ] Don't Know

11. If your answer to question #10 was "Yes", please describe how it made a difference.

School board supplied the administrative level with a base paper, and local teachers will be involved in evaluating and trying to develop differentiated staffing for a new elementary school which should open in Sept 1976. We had been thinking of team teaching now we are considering differentiated staffing

12. If you could reorganize, refocus, alter, or change the program in any way, what would you do to improve the program?

Maybe provide a short list of problem topics which we could be apprised of prior to the participation. The Critical Reading on this problem if interest should be continued.